REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Logue *et al.* (US 2002/0174341).

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Logue *et al.* (US 2002/0174341) in view of Atkinson *et al.* (US 6,367,012).

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 101, § 102 and § 103 rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that claim 1 is not non-statutory 35 U.S.C. § 101, because claim 1 recites the limitation of "said computer file being attached to an email as an email attachment". The computer file of claim 1 is thus useful, tangible, and concrete.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Logue *et al.* (US 2002/0174341).

Claim 1

Applicant respectfully contends that Logue does not anticipate claim 1, because Logue does not teach each and every feature of claim 1. For example, Logue does not teach the feature: "said computer file being attached to an email as an email attachment".

In citing Par. 61 of Logue, the Examiner is alleging that a Universal Resource Locator (URL) is filename of a file. The file may be web page identified by the URL. However, Logue does not teach that the web page identified by the URL is attached to an email as an email attachment.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully maintains that Logue does not anticipate claim 1, and that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2 and 4-9

Applicant respectfully contends that Logue does not anticipate claim 2, because Logue does not teach each and every feature of claim 2. For example, Logue does not teach the feature: "computing a digital signature of the computer file using a private key of a sender".

The Examiner argues that Logue, Par. 61 teaches the preceding feature of claim 1.

In response, Applicant notes that Logue, Par. 61 teaches that a digital signature 730 is appended to a URL 710, but does not teach that the digital signature 730 is a digital signature of

the computer file, said computer file being the web page identified by the URL 710. Nor does

Logue, Par. 61 teach that the digital signature 730 is computed using a private key of a sender.

Applicant cites Logue, Par. 60 which identifies the following parameters as being input to

a hashing function 650 to generate a digital signature 660: [a]n application identifier 610 such as a

host or domain name path, a unique client identifier 620 such as a serial number associated with

the client 220 or a user ID associated with its user, a secret key 630 that is known to the server

210 and the client 220, and a random number 640".

Applicant asserts that none of the aforementioned parameters in Logue, Par. 60 are or

comprise the computer file which the Examiner alleges be represented by the web page identified

by the URL Therefore, Logue does not teach "computing a digital signature of the computer file"

as claimed.

Applicant asserts that none of the aforementioned parameters in Logue, Par. 60 are or

comprise a private key of a sender or user. Therefore, Logue does not teach that a private key of a

sender is used to generate a digital signature as claimed.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully maintains that Logue does not

anticipate claim 2, and that claim 2 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 4-9 depend from

claim 2, Applicant contends that claims 4-9 are likewise in condition for allowance.

In addition with respect to claim 4, Logue does not teach the feature: "wherein the step of

computing a digital signature is based on a public-key algorithm".

The Examiner alleges that Logue teach the preceding feature in Logue, Pars. 57 and 60.

In response, Applicant asserts that Logue, Pars. 57 and 60 do not teach use of a public key

algorithm to compute the digital signature.

Therefore, Logue does not anticipate claim 4.

In addition with respect to claim 5, Logue does not teach the feature: "wherein the step of computing a digital signature includes the steps of: computing a hash value of said computer file; and computing a digital signature of the computed hash value using the private key of the sender".

The Examiner alleges that Logue teach the preceding feature in Logue, Par. 61.

In response, Applicant asserts that Logue, Par. 61 does not teach how the digital signature is computed.

Logue, Par. 60 teaches that several parameters are hashed to compute a hashed value such that the hashed value is the digital signature. However, does not teach that the computed hashed value is further modified (by use of a private key or in any manner) to generate a digital signature, since the hashed value is itself the digital signature. Moreover, none of the parameters used to compute the hashed value (i.e., the parameters of an application identifier such as a host or domain name path, a unique client identifier, a secret key) are or comprise the web page identified by the URL, which the Examiner alleges to represent the claimed computer file.

Therefore, Logue does not anticipate claim 5.

In addition with respect to claim 7, Logue does not teach the feature: "computing a digital signature of the second file using the private key of the sender; and encoding said computed digital signature of the second file in a filename of said second file at a predetermined position or using delimiters".

10/659,111   11

Therefore, Logue does not anticipate claim 7.

Claims 10-13

Applicant respectfully contends that Logue does not anticipate claim 10, because Logue does not teach each and every feature of claim 10.

As a first example of why Logue does not anticipate claim 10, Logue does not teach the feature: "recovering an encoded hash value of the computer file by using a public key of a sender of the computer file and the extracted authentication information".

The Examiner alleges that Logue teach the preceding feature in Logue, Par. 62.

In response, Applicant asserts that Logue, Par. 62 does not teach use of a public key to recover an encoded hash value.

Therefore, Logue does not anticipate claim 10.

As a second example of why Logue does not anticipate claim 10, Logue does not teach the feature: "computing a hash value of said computer file using a hash function used by the sender to generate the encoded authentication information".

The Examiner alleges that Logue teach the preceding feature in Logue, Par. 62.

In response, Applicant asserts that Logue, Par. 62 does not teach computing a hash value of the computer file, and most certainly does not teach computing a hash value of the computer file using a hash function used by the sender to generate the encoded authentication information.

Therefore, Logue does not anticipate claim 10.

As a third example of why Logue does not anticipate claim 10, Logue does not teach the feature: "comparing the encoded and the computed hash values; and, if the encoded and the computed hash values are identical, processing the computer file, else, if the encoded and the computed hash values are different, rejecting the computer file".

The Examiner alleges that Logue teach the preceding feature in Logue, Par. 62.

In response, Applicant asserts that Logue, Par. 62 does not teach comparing the encoded and the computed hash values, and most certainly does not teach that "if the encoded and the computed hash values are identical, processing the computer file, else, if the encoded and the computed hash values are different, rejecting the computer".

Therefore, Logue does not anticipate claim 10.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully maintains that Logue does not anticipate claim 10, and that claim 10 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 11-13 depend from claim 10, Applicant contends that claims 11-13 are likewise in condition for allowance.

In addition with respect to claim 11, Logue does not teach the feature: "extracting said authentication information from the filename of the second file at a predetermined position or using delimiters; recovering an encoded hash value of the second file by using the public key of the sender and the extracted authentication information of the second file; computing a hash value of said second file using a hash function used by the sender to generate the encoded authentication information of the second file; comparing the encoded and the computed hash values of the second file; and if the encoded and the computed hash of the second file values are identical,

processing the second file, else, if the encoded and the computed hash values are different, rejecting the second file".

Therefore, Logue does not anticipate claim 11.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Logue *et al.* (US 2002/0174341) in view of Atkinson *et al.* (US 6,367,012).

Since claim 3 depends from claim 2, which Applicants have argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over Logue under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Applicants maintain that claims 11-12 are likewise not unpatentable over Logue in view of Atkinson under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In addition with respect to claim 3, Logue in view of Atkinson does not disclose the feature: "wherein the step of encoding said computed digital signature includes the step of adding said computed digital signature in the filename just before a file extension comprised by the filename, said file extension being located at an end of the filename".

The Examiner argues: "As per **claim 3,** rejected as applied to claim 2. Logue et al. discloses: computing a digital signature of the computer file using a private key of a sender; and, encoding said computed digital signature in a filename of said computer file at a predetermined position or using delimiters. Logue et al. does not explicitly teach adding said computed digital signature in the filename just before the file extension, said computed digital signature having a fixed size. However, Atkinson et al. discloses: adding said computed digital signature in the filename just before the file extension, said computed digital signature having a fixed size (Column 6, Lines 50-Column 7, Lines 8)."

In response, Applicant asserts that Atkinson, col. 6, line 50 - col. 7, line 8 does not disclose adding said computed digital signature in the filename just before the file extension. In fact Atkinson, col. 6, line 50 - col. 7, line 8 does not even mention a file extension comprised by the filename.

The Examiner further argues that "it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Atkinson et al. in conjunction with the teachings of Logue et al. as stated by Logue et al. in 0061, where it states the signature may be inserted anywhere in the URL."

In response, Applicant cites Logue, Par. 61 which recites: "Although ... the digital signature 730 ... illustrates as being simply appended to the end of the original URL 710, these fields may be inserted anywhere in the original URL 710 **so long as the inserted location is permitted by the governing protocol**" (emphasis added).

Applicant asserts that since the Examiner has not provided evidence that placement of the digital signature just before a file extension comprised by the filename is permitted by the governing protocol, the Examiner's argument is not persuasive.

Therefore, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness in relation to claim 3.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully believes that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457.

Date: _03/12/2007_

Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
22 Century Hill Drive - Suite 302
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850